UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/658,208	09/10/2003	Won-Kyung Seong	45702	3224

7590 06/26/2008

Peter L. Kendall
Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P.
Suite 600
1300 19th Street, N.W.
Washington, DE 20036

EXAMINER	
LEE, MICHAEL	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2622	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/26/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/658,208	SEONG, WON-KYUNG	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	M. Lee	2622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 March 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yang (6,529,742) in view of Park (US2002/0039105).

Regarding claim 1, Yang discloses a television phone showing an input means (32), a control means (30), a tuner (20), a decoder (20, 24, 26), a multiplexer (36), and a display (40). However, Yang does not disclose the video processing means such as to convert the video signal from the decoder into digital video data, processing and storing the converted digital video data on a frame basis, outputting stored video data of a previous frame in a frame period and then outputting the user data. Instead, the multiplexer 36 in Yang performs the video data and user data combining operation in analog format and an ADC converter 42 converts the combined analog signal into digital data thereafter. In any event, Yang teaches that any of the structural elements in the television phone can be replaced with other element that performs the same functions (col. 7, lines 17-25). Park, from the similar field of endeavor, discloses a color display driving apparatus for a portable mobile telephone teaching a digital version of the video and user data combining means, which has the similar functions as the analog combining means as in Yang. As shown in Figure 1, digital television signals YUV,

being format converted and color space converted, are combined with the user data RGB in mixer 24. The combined signal is outputted to a color display unit, such as the LCD 46 in Yang. Hence, it would have been obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to replace the analog combining means of Yang with the digital combining means of Park to perform the well known functions as claimed. Finally, although not shown, the video data and the user data in Park can be configured to present in different time periods such as claimed. For instance, the display unit can be configured to display the video data on the upper portion while the user data on the bottom of the screen, being that the video frame is smaller in size than the actual screen size. This configuration would have been an obvious design choice because the layout of the screen elements can be arranged in any manner by the designer and the OSD mixer 26 in Park is fully capable to carry out such function.

Regarding claim 12, see rejection to claim 1.

Regarding claim 13, see OSD display means in both Yang and Park. They both perform the same functions as claimed. For instance, when a menu or text is needed to be displayed in either Yang or Park, it is selected and read from an OSD memory location and outputted to the display device. The selection, read, and output actions meet the designating, copying, and displaying functions as claimed, respectively.

3. Claims 2-11, and 14-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yang (6,529,742) in view of Park (US2002/0039105), further in view of Narui et al. (6,816,131).

Regarding claim 2, in addition of rejection to claim 1, Park shows a first memory (20), a memory 12, and a format converter 14. Although no detail is shown, the format converter 14 is intended to be replaced with any conventional format converter. Narui, from the similar field of endeavor, teaches a format converter which employs two frame memories (58, 60). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to include the format converter of Narui into Park to perform the well known functions as claimed.

Regarding claim 3, Yang does not specify the user data stored in the first memory as claimed. Since the OSD display in Yang can be used to display any displayable data, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art was made to configured the OSD to display the data as claimed. The configuration of such data would have been an obvious design choice.

Regarding claim 4, the resolution converters in Narui are the same as the format scaler as claimed.

Regarding claim 5, see OSD display means in both Yang and Park. They both perform the same functions as claimed. For instance, when a menu or text is needed to be displayed in either Yang or Park, it is selected and read from an OSD memory location and outputted to the display device. The selection, read, and output actions meet the designating, copying, and displaying functions as claimed, respectively.

Regarding claim 6, Park or Narui does not disclose the still picture capturing function as claimed. In any event, using a cellular camera phone to capture a still image from a video signal is well known in the art. Such feature enables a cellular

phone to be used as a digital camera in which images can be captured and stored for later viewing. By the same token, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify Park or Narui so that the received television images could be captured as still images for later viewing.

Regarding claim 7, Park or Narui does not disclose the rotate key for rotate the image as claimed. Using image transformation means to transform the coordination of an image is well known in the art. Such transformation enables some digital images to be viewed in a better position. For instance, a vertically taken picture might be viewed better horizontally, and vice versa. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to include an image transformation means or rotator into Park or Narui so that the digital image could be viewed in an orientation different than the original and in any size.

Regarding claim 8, the images are scaled up in Narui.

Regarding claims 9 and 10, see the corresponding rejections as set forth above.

Regarding claim 11, Yang does not disclose the Inter Integrated Circuit (I2C-bus) bus interface controller as claimed. In any event, it is well known that the I2C-bus are designed for performing communication functions between intelligent control devices (e.g. microcontrollers), general-purpose circuits (e.g. LCD drivers, remote I/O ports, memories) and application-oriented circuits (e.g. digital tuning and signal processing circuits for radio and video systems). All I2C-bus compatible devices incorporate an on-chip interface which allows them to communicate directly with each other via the I2C-bus. This design concept solves the many interfacing problems encountered when

designing digital control circuits. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include an I2C-bus interface controller into Yang so the MSP 30 and the receiver 18 could be communicated with each other more efficiently.

Regarding claims 14-17, see the corresponding rejections as set forth above.

Regarding claim 18, in addition of all above, Yang does not specify the menu displaying step as claimed but intended to install and display any graphics menu. In any event, the use of a menu as an input selection device is well known in the art. It facilitates a plurality of functions to be selected. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include a selection menu into Yang so that the foregoing mentioned scaling and adjusting functions could be carried out by using a menu displayed on the screen.

4. The following is a double patenting rejection given on 7/6/07. Since applicant fails to submit a Terminal Disclaimer to overcome the rejection, it is repeated below.

Double Patenting

5. Claims 1-18 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-16 of copending Application No. 10/658,545. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 1-18 are generic to all that is recited in claims 1-16 of the copending application. That is, claims 1-18 are anticipated by claims 1-16 of the copending application.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to M. Lee whose telephone number 571-272-7349. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 9 to 6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sinh Tran, can be reached on 571-272-7564. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/M. Lee/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2622